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The County of Sonoma is at a pivotal time in its history. It is rebuilding after the 2017 wildfires that destroyed thousands of homes and dozens of structures, redeveloping its north Santa Rosa government campus, and planning a new terminal for the County Airport. The County recognizes that these projects represent significant changes for the region and present an opportunity to strategize for the inclusion of art and creativity in these projects and others.

The following document is meant to enhance County staff knowledge and understanding of the opportunities and issues involved in managing a public art program and to outline considerations should the County choose to consider a county-wide public art ordinance. This report was created through interviews with public art program administrators from the region and beyond about the structure of their programs and what is and isn’t working; review of public art best practices; and discussions with Creative Sonoma staff. These interviews covered general categories such as public art funding, administrative policy, staffing, collection management, and governance procedures. This report includes:

- A case for public art funding and programming;
- Key factors and best practices to consider when developing a public art program;
- Broad considerations for how to move forward with the development of a public art program;
- A summary of a selection of 12 regional and national city public art programs’ policy and procedures.

The report is intended for use by Creative Sonoma as a guide for discussions with County staff, elected officials, developers, individuals, artists, and the community as they determine why and how the County could best integrate art, design, and place-making into the community as it develops.

The document refers to public art and percent-for-art ordinances which are related terms but not interchangeable. In this document public art is defined as creative expressions in the public realm from memorials and historical monuments to contemporary installations and performance events.1 A percent-for-art ordinance is the mechanism by which a public art program is funded, defines what entities are under its guidance and details how the revenues that are collected can be spent.

The first percent-for-art public art program in the United States was established in 1957 in the City of Philadelphia. The program required that 1% of capital construction costs for public buildings be set aside for art. A decade later, the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) created a public art program to “provide for the best art of our time outside of museum walls” and commissioned an abstract, steel sculpture titled Le Grand Vistess, by Alexander Calder in Grand Rapids, Michigan. More than 700 artworks would be commissioned by the NEA in the three decades following this installation.

Today, there are about 350 public art programs across the United States. Together, they fund thousands of artists’ projects in airports and train stations, libraries, parks, streetscapes, government buildings, and neighborhoods – in urban, suburban, and rural communities.2

Why? Because public art is a powerful tool for change and development in a community.

Public art can make a community safer, promote tourism, contribute to economic vitality, engender pride, spark public discussion and debate, create a reason to gather, play, and talk to one another, and make a place more beautiful and welcoming.

What follows are seven community development outcomes that effective public art programs inspire, as demonstrated through specific examples, and testimonials from the stakeholders and leaders involved in the projects.

---

1. MAKING A CASE FOR PUBLIC ART
PUBLIC ART CAN ENGAGE THE
COMMUNITY IN DISCUSSING DIFFI-
CULT, IMPORTANT/TIMELY ISSUES.
For example in 2018 a project called
ARTruck Residencies will host screen and
digital printmaking residencies to ex-
plore displacement and the housing crisis
affecting San Francisco's Mission District.
Housed in a mobile unit, the residences
will travel along the 16th Street corridor
between Mission and Bryant streets. The
project is a collaboration between Gale-
ria de la Raza curator Alexandra “Lexx”
Valdez and artist-in-residence, Jessica
Sabogal."2

"TEMPORARY PUBLIC ART PROJECTS
ENABLE ARTISTS TO RESPOND TO CRITI-
CAL ISSUES THAT RESONATE WITH THEIR
LOCAL COMMUNITIES. THESE UNIQUE
PROJECTS LEVERAGE INNOVATIVE STO-
RYTELLING AND COMMUNITY BUILDING
to HIGHLIGHT DIVERSE VOICES AND EL-
EVATE UNDERREPRESENTED HISTORIES."
- Shelly Trott, Director of Arts Strategy and Ventures,
Kenneth Rainin Foundation

---

PUBLIC ART CAN HELP REVITALIZE A COMMUNITY.

An example of this is Arthouse: A Social Kitchen. Artist Theaster Gates took an underutilized building and transformed it into a gathering and showplace for visual and culinary arts. The culinary business incubator/art gallery itself became a canvas for two public art commissions on the façade.

The site includes a commercial kitchen that is available for individuals and small businesses to rent for short periods, providing important business tools for start-up food enterprises. And the space is utilized both for art events as well as food business trainings (food handlers’ certification classes) and community events.


"AS MAYOR AND LIFELONG RESIDENT OF GARY, INDIANA I UNDERSTAND HOW IMPORTANT JOBS, INFRASTRUCTURE, EDUCATION AND PUBLIC SAFETY ARE TO A REBUILDING EFFORT. WHILE WE MAINTAIN A LASER FOCUS ON WHAT ARE TRADITIONALLY SEEN AS ‘BREAD AND BUTTER’ ISSUES IN CITIES, I HAVE ALSO COME TO RECOGNIZE THAT ARTS AND CULTURE CAN PLAY A VITAL ROLE IN DEVELOPMENT OF PLACE-MAKING. PROJECTS LIKE ARTHOUSE: A SOCIAL KITCHEN AND ORGANIZATIONS LIKE THE MILLER BEACH ARTS AND CREATIVE DISTRICT HAVE FUELED ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND INNOVATION THAT COMPLEMENTS OUR FOCUS ON TRADITIONAL ISSUES."

PUBLIC ART IS A REFLECTION OF OUR VALUES.

Located at the World Trade Center Transportation Hub in New York City, the installation, titled CHORUS by Ann Hamilton exemplifies this idea. Made with thousands of marble tesserae, the installation spells out text from the U.S. Declaration of Independence and the 1948 United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

“ARTISTS HAVE THE EXTRAORDINARY ABILITY TO USE THEIR VISION AND CREATIVE PROCESS TO CREATE DEEPLY MEANINGFUL CIVIC PLACES. ANN HAMILTON CREATES A PLACE THAT SPEAKS TO OUR HIGHEST IDEALS. THE WOVEN TEXTS OF HER TACTILE WALLS MOVES US THROUGH THE WTC CORTLAND STATION, ACKNOWLEDGING ITS HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE AND EMBRACING THE RIGHTS EMBODIED IN UNIVERSALLY SHARED DECLARATIONS.”

— Sandra Bloodworth, Director MTA Arts & Design, Metropolitan Transportation Authority, Greater New York City Area, New York

“CHORUS” by Ann Hamilton, marble tesserae, 4,350 square feet, World Trade Center Transportation Hub, NYC, photographs courtesy of the New York Metropolitan Transportation Authority and the Ann Hamilton Studio.

PUBLIC ART CAN BE A SOURCE OF HEALING.

In 2018, the City of Coral Springs received a Bloomberg Philanthropies grant for art projects promoting “collective healing and reflection” after the deadly high school shooting in Parkland. As a result of the grant, the city commissioned Petaluma artist David Best, who unveiled a 30-foot nondenominational temple in Parkland on the first anniversary of the mass shooting there on February 14, 2019 as part of this project.4

“The tragic events of February 14, 2018 had a tremendous impact on our city and the city of Parkland. In our grief and sadness, our cities came together to work on healing by presenting this series of temporary public art projects.”

- Lou Cimagilia, Acting Mayor, Coral Springs

PUBLIC ART CAN BE OF BENEFIT TO OUR HEALTH AND WELL-BEING.

Studies demonstrate that public art can have public health benefits. For example, patients in hospitals have been found to experience less anxiety, faster healing, and lowers levels of pain with art in their surroundings. The State of the Field Report: Arts in Healthcare 2009 published by the Society for the Arts in Healthcare states that:

"THERE IS A RICH AND GROWING BODY OF RESEARCH CONNECTING ARTS IN HEALTHCARE PROGRAMS TO IMPROVED QUALITY OF CARE FOR PATIENTS, THEIR FAMILIES, AND EVEN MEDICAL STAFF. STUDIES HAVE PROVEN THAT INTEGRATING THE ARTS INTO HEALTHCARE SETTINGS HELPS TO CULTIVATE A HEALING ENVIRONMENT, SUPPORT THE PHYSICAL, MENTAL, AND EMOTIONAL RECOVERY OF PATIENTS, COMMUNICATE HEALTH AND RECOVERY INFORMATION, AND FOSTER A POSITIVE ENVIRONMENT FOR CAREGIVERS THAT REDUCES STRESS AND IMPROVES WORKPLACE SATISFACTION AND EMPLOYEE RETENTION."

"The Healing Pavilion" by Ball-Nogues Studio, 2,793 linear feet of 2-inch diameter mild steel tube, Cedars-Sinai Medical, Los Angeles. Photograph by Sibylle Allgeier.
PUBLIC ART CAN BE A CATALYST FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT.

Beginning in 2016, the Napa Valley Wine Train partnered with the Napa Valley Vine Trail and the City of Napa to create the City of Napa’s first art district. In two years this partnership has resulted in the commissioning of 22 works of art and the beginning of the transformation of a two-mile long corridor that traverses through the downtown stretch of Napa along the railroad tracks and the Napa Valley Vine Trail walking and biking trail. It is quickly becoming a destination, drawing visitors and locals to downtown Napa. Last year more than 248,000 people walked, biked, or rode the train through the district.

“PUBLIC ART IS TRANSFORMATIVE FOR A COMMUNITY AS IT INSTILLS PRIDE, FOSTERS INVOLVEMENT, PROVOKES THOUGHT AND CREATES PLACE. DONE THOUGHTFULLY, THIS BECOMES A DESTINATION FOR PEOPLE FROM ALL OVER THE WORLD TO COME EXPERIENCE AND ABSORB THE ART, WHICH IN TURN CREATES ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT. IN NAPA, WE ARE FOCUSING ON AN AREA THAT IS A BIT DOWNTRODDEN, AND I TRULY BELIEVE THAT ART WILL BEGIN THE TRANSFORMATION OF THIS AREA TO BECOME NOT ONLY A PUBLIC ART DISTRICT, BUT ALSO TO BECOME AN AREA THAT CAN CREATE A MIX OF USES INCLUDING RETAIL, RESTAURANTS, GALLERIES AND HOUSING FOR PEOPLE OF ALL INCOMES.”

- Scott Goldie, Co-CEO Napa Valley Wine Train and Partner, Brooks Street and Board Member, Rail Arts District Napa (RAD Napa), an evolving arts district in downtown Napa, January 2019.
PUBLIC ART CAN CREATE AN IDENTITY FOR A COMMUNITY.

Known as “the Bean,” the iconic sculpture “Cloud Gate,” by Anish Kapoor has become one of Chicago’s most visited attractions and statements of the city’s identity. Positioned not far from the renowned Chicago Art Institute, the piece which is fabricated with Kapoor’s signature highly polished stainless steel, was designed to reflect the Chicago skyline on the exterior and allow visitors to see reflections of themselves in that context on the interior. It is so popular with visitors that a mini-controversy was sparked when it was rented out for a full day for a corporate event, regardless of the fact that the rental revenues were dedicated to financing free public programs.

“THE INCLUSION OF ART WITHIN THE SUTTER PARK PROJECT WAS AN OBVIOUS DECISION FOR A COUPLE OF REASONS. FIRST, FROM A PLACE-MAKING STANDPOINT, ART CONTRIBUTES TO OUR NEW NEIGHBORHOOD’S HEART AND SOUL. SECOND, BUT EQUALLY IMPORTANT, THE SCULPTURES AT SUTTER PARK PROVIDE CONTEXTUAL WAY-FINDING ELEMENTS TO OUR LAND PLAN.”

- Randy Sater, President, StoneBridge Properties, Sacramento, California
PUBLIC ART CAN HELP DEEPEN CIVIC ENGAGEMENT.

Artworks like “Night Watch,” a silent film of people granted asylum in the United States and installed in New York during the United Nations General Assembly meeting in September 2018, can help us look at, discuss, and better understand difficult issues that we might prefer be left unaddressed.

“PUBLIC ART HAS THE CAPACITY TO CHALLENGE OUR BIASES AND QUESTION THE STATUS QUO, GIVE A VOICE TO THOSE THINGS WE CAN'T FIND THE WORDS FOR, AND DRAW ATTENTION TO ISSUES WE WERE UNAWARE OF — ALL OF WHICH HELPS US UNDERSTAND OURSELVES AND OUR COMMUNITY MORE FULLY.”

- Darrell Steinberg, Mayor, Sacramento, California
2. PUBLIC ART IN SONOMA COUNTY

Public art, by its generic definition of art that is located in public places, is widely evidenced across Sonoma County. Public Art programs, as defined above, have a presence in most cities in the county. Four of the county’s nine cities (Santa Rosa, Petaluma, Sonoma, and Sebastopol) have created ordinances requiring 1% of construction costs in public and/or private development projects be expended on art. Established 25 years ago, the City of Santa Rosa’s public art program with more than 200 works of art, is the oldest and most active program in the county. The County government has a Public Art Advisory Committee and a Policy Statement, but does not have a Percent for Art ordinance.

The county itself has a small collection of portable works (two dimensional artworks such as drawings, paintings, and photographs that can be moved and installed inside of County facilities). Recently Creative Sonoma collaborated with the County Transportation and Public Works Department to commission artworks for an overhead sign on a roadway to discourage oversized trucks from accessing a bridge, one of only a few dozen artworks commissioned by the county and sited in exterior locations. Unincorporated areas and many of the cities within the county purchase art occasionally, but without a streamlined process. Several of the staff interviewed for this report expressed a need for assistance in selecting artworks and a desire to establish a public art program in their community. Lacking staff and the expertise needed to build a program, public art tends to be relegated to the back burner.

The cities of Santa Rosa and Petaluma created public art master plans to guide their individual programs, but there is currently no comprehensive vision establishing ways to connect, direct, or guide the selection of art throughout Sonoma County.
3. KEY FACTORS AND BEST PRACTICES TO BE CONSIDERED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF A PUBLIC ART PROGRAM

Policies and procedures guiding public art funding, administration, art selection, and maintenance can be as diverse and individualistic as the cities employing them. In the agencies interviewed for this report, public art programs fell under Arts Commissions, Cultural Affair Offices, Planning and Economic Development, and other departments and divisions within the city or county. Funding, budgeting and accounting processes and systems are probably the greatest administrative challenge for any public art program. Additionally, there are multiple stakeholders in a public art process – the artist, the agency commissioning the artwork, the audience – or public invested in the project, and public officials. Therefore, it becomes critical to establish a clear set of policies, processes, and systems that are accepted by the county and fully integrated into the county’s administration systems.

What follows is a brief overview of some of the factors to be considered in the development of a public art program.

A. ENGAGE THE COMMUNITY IN THE PROGRAM’S DEVELOPMENT AND THROUGHOUT ITS LIFE.

The planning, placement, and administration of public art is a cooperative process that should involve the participation of:

**County staff** - representation and participation of county staff during the development and throughout the life of the public art program is key – not just the participation of the arts division, but staff from the parks and recreation, economic development, public works, budget, and planning departments.

**Art and design professionals** - artists, art historians, curators, architects, landscape architects, urban designers, and other creatives.

**Educators** - representatives from Sonoma State, Santa Rosa Junior College, and K-12 schools.

**Developers** - representing residential and commercial development in the county.

**Community representatives** - stakeholders from the cities, towns, and unincorporated communities in Sonoma County.

Nonprofit arts and cultural institutions in the area - representatives from County nonprofit art and cultural institutions.

**B. ESTABLISH A CLEAR DEFINITION FOR PUBLIC ART.**

Defining public art for the purposes of an ordinance, policy, and procedures is difficult at best – especially as the practice of making public art constantly expands and evolves. What artists are doing today, may not be the same a few years from now. In the 1930’s and 40’s artists made memorials, monuments, sculpture, and murals. Today artists are creating sound installations, earthworks, community-based projects, new media, interdisciplinary works, and much more in the public realm.

“PUBLIC ART CAN BE MORE THAN AMENITY, ENTERTAINMENT, OR ORNAMENTATION. IT CAN BE A VERY ENERGETIC INVESTIGATION. PUBLIC ART IS NOT A DISCIPLINE OR PROFESSION. IT IS AN IDEA AND WAY OF THINKING ABOUT ART. WHAT MAKES IT PUBLIC IS THAT IT IS SITUATED AT THE CONGESTED CROSSROADS OF AESTHETICS, PUBLIC LIFE, CULTURAL IDEAS, AND POLITICAL ISSUES.”

- Janet Zweig, Public Artist

Therefore, it is recommended that a broad definition of art be used, along with a policy that allows the decision makers (artwork selection panels, commission and councils) the authority to determine what is art and what isn’t for the eligibility purposes of the program and/or project.

The Portland Regional Arts and Culture Council Percent-for-Art Guidelines is a good example of a broad definition of eligible art: “All forms of art conceived in any discipline or medium, including visual, monuments, sculpture, and murals. Today artists are creating sound installations, earthworks, community-based projects, new media, interdisciplinary works, and much more in the public realm.

“PUBLIC ART CAN BE MORE THAN AMENITY, ENTERTAINMENT, OR ORNAMENTATION. IT CAN BE A VERY ENERGETIC INVESTIGATION. PUBLIC ART IS NOT A DISCIPLINE OR PROFESSION. IT IS AN IDEA AND WAY OF THINKING ABOUT ART. WHAT MAKES IT PUBLIC IS THAT IT IS SITUATED AT THE CONGESTED CROSSROADS OF AESTHETICS, PUBLIC LIFE, CULTURAL IDEAS, AND POLITICAL ISSUES.”

- Janet Zweig, Public Artist
C. ESTABLISH FUNDING MECHANISMS THAT ALLOW FOR ART TO BE INTEGRATED INTO THE FABRIC OF THE COMMUNITY AS IT GROWS AND CHANGES.

One of the most common mechanisms for funding public art within a government agency is through a “percent-for-art” mechanism, or when a small percent of eligible capital improvement project (CIP) funds is set aside for the commission, purchase and installation of artworks. The amount allocated through this type of funding mechanism usually ranges from one to two percent of the total CIP. Although there are other types of funding such as annual appropriations, established development fees within certain districts, funding through hotel/motel taxes, grants, gifts, sponsorships, fundraising, and/or a combination of the above, it is a best practice and recommended that the County establish a percent-for-art funding mechanism.

If a percent-for-art strategy is used, an agency defines a baseline for when the percent-for-art allocation will be triggered and further defines which construction budgets are eligible and ineligible for a public art allocation. For example, the City of Sonoma applies one percent-for-art to all construction projects, “with total building permit valuation costs in excess of $250,000.” The City of Sebastopol requires public art as “part of all new developments and major remodels in all commercial and industrial districts over $100,000.” In Sacramento County, the percent-for-art allocation may only be applied to buildings and park construction, while in other cities, eligible costs may be defined more broadly to include utilities, roads, and more.

Conversely, some construction costs are often deemed ineligible and may include things like renovation projects, mechanical, plumbing and electrical system upgrades, annual CIP allocations for security/life safety and health deficiencies, and/or equipment.

A percent-for-art ordinance can apply to public construction, private construction, or both. Deciding which projects are included in the ordinance will shape the specifics of the resulting program. A growing number of city, county, and local art agencies are encouraging developers to include public art in private development. According to a survey done by American’s for the Arts, of 130 local arts agencies surveyed, one third of the respondents currently have a public art in private development program in place or are developing one, or there is great interest in developing one by those without programs. In Sonoma County, the cities of Santa Rosa, Petaluma, and Sebastopol require 1% of private development construction be spent on art (Appendix: Page 34, local, regional, and national public art survey research document).

Administration costs for programs are paid for in a variety of ways. Some agencies set aside 15-33% of percent-for-art funds for administration and supplement these funds with other sources because the set aside is not generally sufficient. As a result, it is highly recommended that a set aside from percent-for-art funds not be the only source of funding for administration of a public art program. In order for a public art program to be successful, a stable funding source, such as the County General Fund, should be included in the plans to fund administration either solely or in conjunction with a portion of the fees set-aside specifically for administration.

To that end, it is also recommended that the policy guiding use of the percent-for-art funds, and any related public art funds, be flexible enough to fund and/or supplement the variety of costs of the program including but not limited to the production of works of temporary and permanent public art, artwork maintenance and conservation (Section H), administration costs, collection management, and artwork purchases. The policy should also be flexible enough to include a wide variety of public art including permanent and temporary installations (Section G) and performing arts (Section G).

“AS MAYOR, I WILL FULLY SUPPORT MY ARTS COMMISSION AND ITS PROFESSIONAL SELECTION COMMITTEES SO THAT THEY CAN COMMISSION A FULL RANGE OF ART THAT IS DARING AND, WHEN APPROPRIATE, DARINGLY TRADITIONAL.”

- Gavin Newsom, Former Mayor of San Francisco and Governor, State of California
To provide flexibility to administration budgets, it is also recommended the County establish a “public art fund” that allows for pooling percent-for-art funds both for administration and to purchase art. Pooling funds for the purchase of art allows for cultural and geographic equity and inclusion in the program.

D. RESPONSIBILITIES FOR CIVIC LEADERS, STAFF, AND THE PUBLIC.

Most public art programs are overseen by volunteer commissions, councils, or committees who establish public art policy and procedures and select artists. All programs require staff who manage the day to day aspects of the program.

The roles and responsibilities of staff, appointed and elected officials, artwork and artist selection panels, and others integral to the development and approval of art program planning, policy, and artwork selection is the foundation of any affective public art program.

Nearly universally, art commissions and/or councils are established by the governing authority (such as a city council, town council, or board of supervisors) and charged with approval authority over art design and location; and developing policy and planning documents. There are some exceptions in which the governing body signs off on art plans or in rare cases a “strong mayor” form of government which gives the mayor approval authority over all art commission, council, and committee recommendations.

There are multiple ways to select art, but all good processes begin with the establishment of an informed and qualified selection panel that align with the principles outlined in the Americans for the Arts Statement on Cultural Equity. The art selection panel is a working committee that makes recommendations to the Arts Commission and/or Council about the selection of artists and artwork designs. The panel is comprised of arts professionals (curators, contemporary art historians, artists), members of the community in which the artwork will be sited, representatives from the arts commission or council, and a representative (if applicable) from the project design team architect or landscape architect.

In many cases contracts over a certain dollar amount (consistent with the governing body staff contract approval policy) are brought to the governing body for approval. Once approved, it is recommended, though, that staff be given the authority to contract with artists without the governing body’s approval, as long as the artist selection process is consistent with an established policy that involves the participation of an arts commission, committee, or council as outlined above.

E. ESTABLISH FAIR AND THOUGHTFUL WAYS TO WORK WITH ARTISTS EARLY ON IN A PROJECT’S DEVELOPMENT.

When a public art project involves new construction, artists should be selected prior to the start of the overall project design to ensure artwork is integrated seamlessly into the project site and budget. When artists are selected after the building or site has been designed, the project has broken ground, or after its completion, the cost of the art can go up and what is possible to design and build compromised. If it is not possible to engage the artist prior to the start of the project, a process should be developed to ensure that the building or project designers, contractors, (and others as necessary), and the artist are able to plan, communicate, and collaborate so that the artwork is seamlessly integrated into the project timeline and budget.

F. ENGAGE EXPERIENCED AND QUALIFIED STAFF.

Public art administration and curating is a professional practice. A background in arts administration, art, art history, architecture, landscape architecture, construction management, or a related field and experience in public art, community, or capital construction project coordination is key to the success of a public art program.
A public art administrator manages public art project development including releasing calls for artists, providing technical assistance to applicants, overseeing the artist selection process, budget development, and construction and artwork design development. Administrators prepare and produce outreach and education materials, artwork dedication events and community meetings, and administer contracts. On average, a public art administrator can juggle between 8–16 public art projects at once, requiring strong multi-tasking skills.

G. ALLOW FOR COMMISSIONS OF TEMPORARY PUBLIC ART INCLUDING THE PERFORMING ARTS.

As noted above, it is recommended that temporary public art be eligible under the percent-for-art ordinance. Temporary programs allow the public to experience art disciplines that cannot be translated to permanent materials in the public realm. They afford emerging public artists the opportunity to practice their skills and test their ideas in public. Artists are also able to address current ideas and issues that may not be relevant in the long run.

The Regional Arts and Culture Council (serving arts organizations, schools and residents throughout Clackamas, Multnomah, and Washington counties in Oregon) offers temporary public art opportunities to artists, “to engage the public without being concerned about building a permanent installation. Temporary art-works may be created with unusual media or installed in unexpected places. They may benefit a particular cause; pique public awareness of an important or timely issue; or simply add momentary beauty to a site.”

It is recommended specific language be created in an agency’s public art policy that allows funding of performance with appropriate parameters (see the Cities of Denver and Austin as examples).

H. ESTABLISH ADEQUATE FUNDING FOR COLLECTION MAINTENANCE, CONSERVATION, MANAGEMENT, PUBLIC RELATIONS AND EDUCATION.

Adequate funding for collection maintenance and conservation is usually not an issue at the beginning of a program’s development, but as a collection grows and ages, it can quickly become difficult to fund and manage. Art is no different than a building, garden, plaza, or park – a small investment in regular maintenance can help alleviate the need for large investments later when the artwork requires a major and costly conservation.

It is critical that maintenance and conservation plans are created from the beginning as artworks are commissioned and that artworks are regularly assessed (annually or bi-annually), and funding is set aside annually based on these assessments and plans. As a collection grows, it will become necessary to employ collection managers.

Some programs allow for a portion of the percent-for-art set aside to be expended on maintenance. However, even a 5% set aside, as San Francisco allows, does not typically generate enough revenues for the full maintenance and conversation of an artwork over its lifespan.

It is recommended that commissioned artists create detailed maintenance and conservation plans. In the City of Denver, public artworks are assessed annually, budgets for conservation and maintenance for specific artworks are established, and then requested in the annual budgeting process, and the approved funds are placed in a carry-over fund (or fund that does not need to be used in the budget year) for maintenance and conservation of artworks.

Another example for funding public art maintenance is the County of Sacramento’s $2 million-dollar endowment for art at the Sacramento International Airport. The interest generated from the endowment may be used for the maintenance and conservation of art, ongoing public relations and education, commissioning/purchasing temporary art.
and permanent works of art, and for exhibitions at the Sacramento International Airport. The set aside was possible because the project budget for art was a large amount—$8 million dollars.

I. ESTABLISH POLICIES FOR ACCEPTING GIFTS AND LOANS AND DECOMMISSIONING ARTWORKS.

Acquiring art through gifts, donations, and/or loans is a standard best practice. Most city and county art programs create a policy that will ensure a review process and acceptance of gifts, loans, and donations based on criteria that supports the mission and goals of the art program. Donations need to be reviewed as carefully as commissioned works of art. Is there funding to install and maintain the artwork over time? Is there an appropriate site that is available for the artwork? Is the artwork of high artistic quality? Can the governing body decommission the artwork in the future?

Like most elements in the built environment, public art won’t last forever. In fact, the average life of a “permanent” public artwork is defined by most public art agencies as 20 years. As an artwork gets older there may be valid reasons to decommission or deaccession it including deterioration, damage beyond reasonable repair, and/or lack of funding for significant maintenance and/or conservation. A decommissioning policy should define the decommissioning criteria and a process for assessing and deciding the fate of an artwork based on that criteria.

Additionally, American’s for the Arts Best Practices state that artist “Agreements should provide that, in the event of damage, alteration, or destruction of an Artwork that is not remedied to Artist’s satisfaction, or relocation without Artist’s approval, if the Artist believes the Artwork no longer represents his/her work, the Artist should have the right to remove his/her name from the Artwork.”

4. SETTING THE STAGE

4. SETTING THE STAGE

BROAD CONSIDERATIONS FOR HOW TO MOVE FORWARD WITH THE DEVELOPMENT OF A PUBLIC ART PROGRAM IN THE COUNTY

The County of Sonoma is a unique place that functions under an equally unique set of circumstances. As the community continues to evolve, it is recommended that the county works toward establishing mechanisms for integrating art into the built environment by developing a public art master or strategic plan. Many communities develop a master plan to guide the vision, goals, and objectives of their public art program. A master plan will serve as a mechanism to match the unique priorities and situations of the County of Sonoma’s overall development to the public art program. A master plan will serve as a mechanism to match the unique priorities and situations of the County of Sonoma’s overall development to the public art program. Additionally, the planning process can help flesh out the policies, procedures and systems at a level of detail not necessarily included in an ordinance. It creates a structure for the community to participate in shaping policy and can lead to the eventual support of the ordinance and program by the community. More specifically, the master plan should engage the community in:

- Creating a vision for integrating art into the county’s physical environment through community engagement (section 3A);
- Exploring mechanisms for funding public art and art in private development projects (section 3C);
- Assessing existing and priority sites for art in the county;
- Establishing art selection and approval processes (sections 3D and E);
- Creating recommendations for staffing and administering a public art program (3F);
- Recommending the best way to fund and manage the conservation and maintenance of public art (section 3H);
- Creating policies for de-accessioning existing artworks and accepting artwork gifts and loans (section 3I); and
- Documenting existing works of art in the county collection.
Before and during the county strategic planning process it is recommended that Creative Sonoma produce a series of programs and projects in the short term (next 1–3 years) that engage the community in thinking, writing, and discussing public art through workshops, lectures, and the production of temporary public artworks. When possible, these programs should be produced in partnership – especially with educators (Sonoma State University, Santa Rosa Junior College, K-12 schools), the business community (Public Improvement Business Districts, Chambers of Commerce), and with art centers, towns, and communities in county unincorporated areas.

In the research process, it was apparent that cities, towns, and unincorporated communities in the county would benefit greatly from public art technical services and a central place that city and town administrators could rely on for advice, resources, and tools to develop public art programs in their communities.

Finally, the County should include artists, art educators, and other arts professionals in the planning phases for the new North Santa Rosa county government campus.

“The Last Billboard” by Jon Rubin, East Liberty Neighborhood, Pittsburg, PA, 2010–present. Each month a different individual is invited to use the billboard. Photograph courtesy of www.jonnrubin.net
**APPENDIX**

**INTERVIEWS:**
- Cindy Bagley, Community Services Manager, City of Rohnert Park
- Rebecca Barr, City Clerk, City of Sonoma
- Michael Chavez, Public Art Program Manager, City and County of Denver, Colorado
- Kim Curry-Evans, Public Art Program Director, City of Scottsdale, Arizona
- Caroline Judy, Director of the Sonoma County General Services Department
- Sue Lambe, Art in Public Places Program Manager, City of Austin, Texas
- Olivia Lemen, Analyst, Town of Windsor
- Kristen Madsen, Director, Creative Sonoma
- Vicki Parker, Community Development Director, City of Cotati
- Kari Svanstrom, City Planner, City of Sebastopol
- MarkThemig, Parks and Recreation Department Director, City of Healdsburg
- Tara Thompson, Arts Coordinator, City of Santa Rosa

**ORDINANCES AND POLICIES REVIEWED:**
- City of Austin, TX
  https://library.municode.com/tx/austin/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=TIT7LICUAC_CHT2ARPUPL#TIT7LICUAC_CHT2ARPUPL_S7-2-ID
- City of Portland, OR
  https://www.portlandoregon.gov/citycode/28803
- City of Denver, CO
  Crush Walls: https://crushwalls.org/
  Mural program: https://denverpublicart.org/urban-arts-fund/
- City of Napa, CA
  https://www.cityofnapa.org/687/Public-Art-Ordinance
- City of Petaluma, CA
  http://www.cityofpetaluma.net/cdd/publicart.html
- County of Sacramento, CA
  http://www.sacmetroarts.org/-/media/MetroArts/Files/SMAC_Ord_County.pdf?la=en
- City of Santa Rosa, CA
  https://www.arci.org/793/Public-Art-in-Private-Development
- City of Scottsdale, Arizona
  https://sebastopol.municipal.codes/5MC/7.31O
- City of Rohnert Park
  https://library.municode.com/ca/rohnert_park/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=TIT2ADPE_CH2.32PARECO_2.32.040PG

**RESOURCES AND OTHER DOCUMENTS REVIEWED:**
- Americans for the Arts, Public Art Network, 2016 Best Practices Document
- Knight Soul of the Community 2010
  https://knightfoundation.org/sites/overall-findings/
- Bloomberg Philanthropies
- FORECAST: “The Power of Impermanence: Temporary art’s impact on struggling communities”.
- Public Art Toolkit: Creative City Network of Canada
- “WOT FOR And other questions on the use of public art” by Janet Zweig
  http://www.janetzweig.com/Zweigarticles/Zweig_WOTFor.pdf
- Public Art: An Essential Component of Creating Communities” by Jack Becker
- Public Art in Private Development: A guide for Local Arts Agencies and Municipalities
  https://www.americansforthearts.org/sites/default/files/pdf/2014/by_program/research_studies_and_publications/one_pagers/ArtsInHealthcare.pdf
- Americans for the Arts Statement on Cultural Equity
  https://www.americansforthearts.org/about-americans-for-the-arts/cultural-equity
- San Francisco Arts Commission Guidelines for Temporary Public Art
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/Santa Rosa, California</th>
<th>City of Napa, California</th>
<th>City of Petaluma, California</th>
<th>City of Cotati, California</th>
<th>City of Healdsburg, California</th>
<th>City of Rohnert Park, California</th>
<th>City of Sebastopol, California</th>
<th>City of Sonoma, California</th>
<th>Town of Windsor, California</th>
<th>City of Austin, Texas</th>
<th>City and County of Sacramento, California</th>
<th>City and County of Denver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact</strong></td>
<td>Recreation and Parks, Art in Public Places Program</td>
<td>CONTACT: Tara Thompson, Arts Coordinator at <a href="mailto:tthompson@srcity.org">tthompson@srcity.org</a> or (707) 540-4052</td>
<td>City of Napa, Art in Public Places Program</td>
<td>CONTACT: Vicki Parker, Director of Recreation Services Recreation Manager Phone: 707-227-9588 <a href="mailto:ktparker@cityofnapa.com">ktparker@cityofnapa.com</a></td>
<td>City of Petaluma Public Art Program CONTACT: Annette Knight, Public Art Specialist, City of Petaluma, 707 588-7031 <a href="mailto:awknight@cityofpetaluma.com">awknight@cityofpetaluma.com</a></td>
<td>City of Cotati Community Development Department CONTACT: Vicki Parker, Director of Public Affairs <a href="mailto:vpark@cotati.ca.gov">vpark@cotati.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>City of Healdsburg Parks and Recreation Department CONTACT: Mark Watt, Recreation Manager</td>
<td>City of Rohnert Park, Public Art Program CONTACT: Cindy Clasen, City Planning Department cityofrohnertpark.org</td>
<td>City of Sebastopol Public Arts Commission CONTACT: City Clerk, Rebecca Barn, (707) 833-2255 <a href="mailto:rbran@sebastopol.org">rbran@sebastopol.org</a></td>
<td>City of Austin Texas, Art in Public Places Program CONTACT: Susan Lambe, AIPP Program Manager (512) 944-7652 790 Lamar Boulevard 1st Floor Suite 110</td>
<td>City of Denver Arts &amp; Cultural Affairs, Public Art Program CONTACT: Michael Chavez, Public Art Program Manager <a href="mailto:michael.chavez@denvergov.org">michael.chavez@denvergov.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Name</strong></td>
<td>Public Art Program</td>
<td>No established program</td>
<td>No established program</td>
<td>No established program</td>
<td>No program established</td>
<td>No program established</td>
<td>Public Art Program</td>
<td>Program is overseen by the Cultural and Fine Arts Commission. Established policy and procedures and an ordinance in 2008.</td>
<td>Town of Windsor Public Advisory Commission Art Program</td>
<td>City of Austin Cultural Arts Division, Art in Public Places Program</td>
<td>Public Art Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City/County/ Town approximate population</strong></td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>77,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>(service area 35,000)</td>
<td>1,648 (Sonoma urban area is 32,678)</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>964,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department/Division within city/county structure in which program is located</strong></td>
<td>Planning and Economic Development Department Parks and Recreation Services Department</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>City Manager’s office Parks and Recreation Department</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation Department</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation Department</td>
<td>City Planning Department</td>
<td>City Clerk’s office Parks and Recreation Department</td>
<td>Economic Development Division Convention and Cultural Services Department</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Cultural Division of Cultural Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year established</strong></td>
<td>The public art program was established in 1996, but public and private development funding was included in the establishment of an ordinance that were not created until 2006.</td>
<td>The first program, the Art Walk, was established in 2000/2001. A public art ordinance was passed in 2002.</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Staff not sure Policy and Procedures were created in 2009.</td>
<td>The Town began commis- sioning artworks in 2005 and a program - but not funded - was established in 2008. MT was DRAFTED a policy requir- ing 1% of all future housing development be allocated to art. This policy has not been ratified by the City Council.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1991 (ordinance established in 1995)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the city have a public art master plan?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (established in 2003)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is there a public art in transit program in the city/county and how is this interface with the program?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No, but the City of Petaluma Public Art Master Plan does include priority sites within the public transportation system.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the city/county have a percentage for public art?</strong></td>
<td>Yes: 1%</td>
<td>Yes: 1%</td>
<td>Yes: 1%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes: 1%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact</strong></td>
<td>Vicki Parker, Director of Recreation Services Recreation Manager Phone: 707-227-9588 <a href="mailto:ktparker@cityofnapa.com">ktparker@cityofnapa.com</a></td>
<td>City of Cotati Community Development Department CONTACT: Vicki Parker, Director of Public Affairs <a href="mailto:vpark@cotati.ca.gov">vpark@cotati.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>City of Healdsburg Parks and Recreation Department CONTACT: Mark Watt, Recreation Manager</td>
<td>City of Rohnert Park, Public Art Program CONTACT: Cindy Clasen, City Planning Department cityofrohnertpark.org</td>
<td>City of Sebastopol Public Arts Commission CONTACT: City Clerk, Rebecca Barn, (707) 833-2255 <a href="mailto:rbran@sebastopol.org">rbran@sebastopol.org</a></td>
<td>City of Austin Texas, Art in Public Places Program CONTACT: Susan Lambe, AIPP Program Manager (512) 944-7652 790 Lamar Boulevard 1st Floor Suite 110</td>
<td>City of Denver Arts &amp; Cultural Affairs, Public Art Program CONTACT: Michael Chavez, Public Art Program Manager <a href="mailto:michael.chavez@denvergov.org">michael.chavez@denvergov.org</a></td>
<td>City of Austin Texas, Art in Public Places Program CONTACT: Susan Lambe, AIPP Program Manager (512) 944-7652 790 Lamar Boulevard 1st Floor Suite 110</td>
<td>City of Denver Arts &amp; Cultural Affairs, Public Art Program CONTACT: Michael Chavez, Public Art Program Manager <a href="mailto:michael.chavez@denvergov.org">michael.chavez@denvergov.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact</strong></td>
<td>Vicki Parker, Director of Recreation Services Recreation Manager Phone: 707-227-9588 <a href="mailto:ktparker@cityofnapa.com">ktparker@cityofnapa.com</a></td>
<td>City of Cotati Community Development Department CONTACT: Vicki Parker, Director of Public Affairs <a href="mailto:vpark@cotati.ca.gov">vpark@cotati.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>City of Healdsburg Parks and Recreation Department CONTACT: Mark Watt, Recreation Manager</td>
<td>City of Rohnert Park, Public Art Program CONTACT: Cindy Clasen, City Planning Department cityofrohnertpark.org</td>
<td>City of Sebastopol Public Arts Commission CONTACT: City Clerk, Rebecca Barn, (707) 833-2255 <a href="mailto:rbran@sebastopol.org">rbran@sebastopol.org</a></td>
<td>City of Austin Texas, Art in Public Places Program CONTACT: Susan Lambe, AIPP Program Manager (512) 944-7652 790 Lamar Boulevard 1st Floor Suite 110</td>
<td>City of Denver Arts &amp; Cultural Affairs, Public Art Program CONTACT: Michael Chavez, Public Art Program Manager <a href="mailto:michael.chavez@denvergov.org">michael.chavez@denvergov.org</a></td>
<td>City of Austin Texas, Art in Public Places Program CONTACT: Susan Lambe, AIPP Program Manager (512) 944-7652 790 Lamar Boulevard 1st Floor Suite 110</td>
<td>City of Denver Arts &amp; Cultural Affairs, Public Art Program CONTACT: Michael Chavez, Public Art Program Manager <a href="mailto:michael.chavez@denvergov.org">michael.chavez@denvergov.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Santa Rosa, California</td>
<td>City of Napa, California</td>
<td>City of Parkk City of Santa Rosa, California</td>
<td>City of Healdsburg, California</td>
<td>City of Redwood Park, California</td>
<td>City of Sonoma, California</td>
<td>City of Windsor, California</td>
<td>City of Austin, Texas</td>
<td>City and County of Sacramento, California</td>
<td>City and County of Denver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the preeminent public art program funding source?</td>
<td>CIP set-aside for public art</td>
<td>CIP set-aside for public art</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>There is funding for a temporary public art program</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Other CIP funds and General Fund</td>
<td>CIP and an annual 2% set-aside from general fund to acquire works of public art</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>CIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the other sources of funding for public art projects?</td>
<td>General Fund: primarily for public art and other sources.</td>
<td>General Fund: staff costs are absorbed into the General Fund.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>The City has funded public art from various sources.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>See above.</td>
<td>General Fund and private sources through fund raising</td>
<td>General Fund, Trans Occupancy Tax (TOT)</td>
<td>Special Revenue Fund (for staff and operations)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible construction costs (in bold)</td>
<td>Public: CIP projects for park and development fund, and involving construction, remediation, or improvement of any building, structure, park, public utility, street, sidewalk, or parking facility. Local public acquisition costs may only be spent on public art in parks projects. Private: having construction costs of $500,000 or more.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Requires public art as part of all new developments and major remodeling in all commercial and industrial districts over $900,000 (Private and Public).</td>
<td>All City construction projects with total building permit valuation costs in excess of $250,000, funded after the adoption of the Public Art Ordinance will contribute to the City’s Public Art Fund. Estimated construction cost of new City-owned facilities, including buildings, parks, and recreation projects are eligible expenditures of public art.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineligible construction costs (italic)</td>
<td>Public: Abuse or fraud of a park or public works project with budgets more than $500,000. Private: Abuse ground elements of a park or public works project with budgets more than $500,000.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary improvements, including construction, remediation, or reconstruction of streets, sidewalks, parks, playgrounds, or any other site, or structures which have been damaged by fire, flood, earthquake or other calamity; affordable housing construction, remodeling, or reconstruction; public works projects, street improvement projects, landscaping, or major remodels in all districts over $100,000.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the agency pool funds?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, but in general should be installed at or near building or project in which the funds were allocated.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Allowed to pool funds for administration costs only.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What can be paid out of pool funds?</td>
<td>The ordinance does not specify. The Art in Public Places Committee determines how funds are spent.</td>
<td>These funds CANNOT be used for temporary public art projects, staff, program planning, or artwork maintenance.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Staff, temporary, public art, artwork maintenance and coordination, artwork purchase.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Public art administration, artworks, artwork maintenance, artwork purchase.</td>
<td>Administrative and artwork maintenance.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can CIP funds be used for temporary public art projects?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No. Only projects that are &quot;enduring&quot; may be funded through the program.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Does the agency allow in-lieu fees for private development?

Yes

Public art review process roles and responsibilities? Is there an approval process? Does the city council/DSD approve artwork design, contracts, both?

The Public Art Steering Committee is the final authority on all artwork projects. The ordinance does not require any other approvals from Council. However, Council must approve the de-accessioning of artworks.

The Public Art Committee reviews and recommends artwork for public display. The Planning Commission approves artworks funded by the private sector. Council must approve artwork designs and artist contracts.

The City has not established a review process for the purchase or donation of art. The City Commission who oversees over where the artwork will be located AND the Planning Commission make recommendations to City Council.

City Council authorizes funds for public art and accepts or rejects gifts, loans, or public art. The Cultural Arts Commission recommends art budgets, administers the program, selects and approves artwork.

The Commission makes recommendations to City Council who generally approves contracts only, but do have the opportunity to weigh in on the artwork design.

Art in Public Places Program reviews and makes recommendations to the Arts Commission who make recommendations to the City Council if the artwork budget is over staff’s administration authority. A panel comprised of a contracted visual arts professionals is usually selected to select artists and approve artwork designs. The panel recommenders are given to the Arts Commission for review. Arts Commission makes recommendations to City Council for approval on over $500,000 (administrative authority). Board of Supervisors approves all artwork regardless of contract amount. City Council approves contracts and designs over $500,000. County Administrative Committee approves artwork contracts and designs.

A Selection Committee composed of a minimum of eight member reviews the artwork’s artist and approves artwork design. The artwork design then goes to the Denver Cultural Affairs Commission, Public Art Committee. This Committee only reviews the feasibility of the artwork – NOT AESTHETICS. The Public Art Committee is a technical review committee only. The Cultural Affairs Commission weighs in on the process to make sure all artwork is in a transparent process and ultimately the Mayor signs off. The artwork does not go to City Council. However, artwork donations DO go to City Council.

What are the sources of funds for administration costs?

General Fund. There was a short time in which staff was funded by the “Art Fund” but that was deemed inappropriately use of funds by the City Attorney’s office.

General Fund: Staff costs are absorbed into the General Fund. Staff is paid from the Public Art Fund. N/A General Fund.

Community Services Program Manager. Up to 20% of project set aside and the General Fund.

CIP and General Fund.

CIP and Hotel/Motel Tax.

CIP General Fund.

Special Revenue Fund (the staff and operations).

Number of staff and consultants?

One FTE who works 1/2 time for the public art program and 1/2 time on other duties as assigned. The equivalent of one 1/2 time.

One contract employee for 1/2 of their time.

Contract employees for approximately 20% of their time.

One City Planning staff manages public art program along with her duties as a city planner.

City Council reviews all projects. Private projects must be approved by the Design Review Board. City Council reviews all aspects of the program “as it deems necessary.”

City Council authorizes funds for public art and accepts or rejects gifts, loans, or public art. The Cultural Arts Commission recommends art budgets, administers the program, selects, and approves artwork.

The Art in Public Places Program reviews and makes recommendations to the Arts Commission who make recommendations to the City Council if the artwork budget is over staff’s administration authority. A panel comprised of visual artists professionals is usually selected to select artists and approve artwork designs. The panel recommenders are given to the Arts Commission for review. Arts Commission makes recommendations to City Council for approval on over $500,000 (administrative authority). Board of Supervisors approves all artwork regardless of contract amount. City Council approves contracts and designs over $500,000. County Administrative Committee approves artwork contracts and designs.

A Selection Committee comprised of a minimum of eight member reviews the artwork’s artist and approves artwork design. The artwork design then goes to the Denver Cultural Affairs Commission, Public Art Committee. This Committee only reviews the feasibility of the artwork – NOT AESTHETICS. The Public Art Committee is a technical review committee only. The Cultural Affairs Commission weighs in on the process to make sure all artwork is in a transparent process and ultimately the Mayor signs off. The artwork does not go to City Council. However, artwork donations DO go to City Council.

Average number of projects on an individual staff member manages:

Five

Three

Two

Two

Four FTE (program administrators) and one 1/2 time consultant who is 1/2 time.

Four FTE (program administrators) and one 1/2 time program administrator. One collection management consultant who is 1/2 time.

Approximate number of artworks in the collection:

220 (includes 80 portable works of art)

10 - permanent works of art in the public art collection and 12 in the private collection.

City does not own any permanent works of art. The City has a temporary public art program and has works on loan.

Information unavailable.

Unknown

Unreasonably. Approximately 12.

Two. Two more will be added to the collection in the near future.

330 (includes portable works and donations). 400 (includes portable works and gifts).

How is artwork maintenance, public relations, and education funded?

Public Art Fund.

Public Art Fund.

No process established. Staff and program are new. This has not been fully realized.

CIP and General Fund.

General fund.

CIP allocations, General Fund, and one-time set-asides for maintenance. Artwork maintenance is funded through CIP set-asides as necessary. Education and public relations is absorbed in the Division’s operations budget.

Does the agency have a relocation/de-accessioning policy?
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Does the agency have a relocation/de-accessioning policy?

Yes
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Santa Rosa, California</th>
<th>City of Napa, California</th>
<th>City of Petaluma, California</th>
<th>City of Cotati, California</th>
<th>City of Healdsburg, California</th>
<th>City of Rohnert Park, California</th>
<th>City of Sebastopol, California</th>
<th>City of Sonoma, California</th>
<th>Town of Windsor, California</th>
<th>City of Austin, Texas</th>
<th>City and County of Sacramento, California</th>
<th>City and County of Denver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the agency have a policy for murals commissioned by the private sector?</td>
<td>No, however guidelines have been developed</td>
<td>No. However, a permit is required.</td>
<td>No. However, generally when a mural project is reviewed through the permit process, the City recommends the artwork be reviewed by the Public Art Committee as an information-only item.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, but it is still being fine-tuned.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES**

Staff noted that the County of Sonoma is progressive in so many ways and that it would be great to bring an art dimension to the work they do, and along with that assistance to smaller cities within the County as well as communities in unincorporated areas.

The City has established funding for and will embark upon a cultural planning process in 2019.

At one time the city established an Arts Commission, but in 2004 the work of the Arts Commission was folded into the Parks Commission. Conversations have started again about establishing a public art program.

The City has established funding for and will embark upon a cultural planning process in 2019.

Staff has done research and hopes to review her recommendations for the establishment of public art funding with the Commission and Council in the near future.

The City and County are in the process of reorganizing the program so that it is NOT a joint city/county program, but a stand-alone program in the city and in the county.
The MISSION of Creative Sonoma® is to support and advance the creative community of Sonoma County.